

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.		FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/758,308 01/10/2001		01/10/2001	Howard A. Fields	14114.0349U2	9952
23859	7590	03/26/2003			
		NBERG P C	EXAMINER		
ATLANTA		TREET N E 303-1811		LI, BAO Q	
				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				1648	1/
				DATE MAILED: 03/26/2003	16

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-13- 13-		
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/758,308	FIELDS ET AL.
•	Examiner	Art Unit
	Bao Qun Li	1648
Th MAILING DATE of this communication appe		
THE REPLY FILED 03 March 2003 FAILS TO PLACE TI Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to av final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application and single of the contract	ation. A proper reply to a high places the application in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]	
 a)	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin	g date of the final rejection.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	of extension and the corresponding amousthe shortened statutory period for reply be later than three months after the mai	ount of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>20 March 2003</u>. App 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF 		
$2. \boxtimes$ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:	
(a) $oxed{oxed}$ they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceling	ng a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claims.
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .		
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejecti	on(s):	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: Sec		dered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	to issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we	, , ,	
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed: <i>None</i> .		
Claim(s) objected to: <u>9-13</u> .		
Claim(s) rejected: <u>7-13 and 26-31</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 1-6 and 14-	<u>-25</u> .	
8. $\hfill \square$ The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b) disapp	roved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	·
10. Other:		
		Bao Qun Li Acrogust
	·	Margune

U.S. Palent and Trademark Office PTO-303 (Rev. 04-01)

Advisory Action Paper No. 14

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)



Continuation of 2. NOTE: the amendment of claims 9-13, "wherien the mosaic polypeptide is not the HCV polypeptide" raises a new matter and newly issue that requir further search and consideration.

Furthermore, the newly submitted claims 9-13 and 32-40 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: they are directed to an mosaic polypeptide comprising an antigenic epitope of HCV (claim 9) or NS3 (claim 10), or NS4 (Claim 11 or 12) or NS5 (claim 13) respectively because each of the claim are independent each from other, which indicate each mosaic polypeptide does not or does not necessarily contain more than one epitopes from each of the HCV core, NS3, NS4 and NS5 region. Theses claims are no longer directed to a mosaic polypeptide comprising an antigenic epitope from each of the hepatitis C virus (HCV) core protein, nonstructural protein 3 (NS3) and nonstructural protein 4 (NS4) as it is claimed in the originally elected group I.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 9-13 and 32-40 are withdrawn from consideration as being

directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Since the amendment has not been entered, all rejections made in the previous Office action are maintained.

JAMES HOUSEL

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINES
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600